

**REMARKS**

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated May 8, 2007 (“*Office Action*”). Claims 1-32 are pending, and the Examiner rejects all pending claims. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

**I. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102 -- Claims 1-3, 5-12, 14-20, 22, 23, and 25-31 are patentable over Magret.**

The Examiner rejects Claims 1-3, 5-12, 14-20, 22, 23, and 25-31 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,804,221 issued to Magret et al. (“*Magret*”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and submits that *Magret* does not describe, expressly or inherently, each and every limitation of the claims.

Consider Applicant’s independent Claim 1, which recites:

A system for distributing packets for communication to a mobile unit comprising:

a mobile unit having a device identifier and an internet protocol (IP) address comprising a first subnet identifier, the mobile unit roaming in a foreign network having a second subnet identifier;

a mobility manager operable to determine a multicast address for the mobile unit based on the device identifier, to receive multicast address requests that include the device identifier, and to communicate the multicast address responsive to the multicast address requests;

a foreign agent in the foreign network, the foreign agent operable to detect the mobile unit, to determine the device identifier for the mobile unit, to communicate a request including the device identifier to the mobility manager, to receive the multicast address from the mobility manager, and to register for a multicast group identified by the multicast address; and

a home agent operable to receive IP packets addressed to the mobile unit, to determine the multicast address associated with the mobile unit, to encapsulate the IP packets as payloads for multicast packets addressed to the multicast address, and to communicate the multicast packets for receipt by devices registered for the multicast group using a packet network.

Applicant respectfully submits that *Magret* fails to teach every element of this claim. Among other aspects, *Magret* fails to disclose “a home agent operable to receive IP packets addressed to the mobile unit . . . [and] to encapsulate the IP packets as payloads for multicast packets addressed to the multicast address,” as required by Claim 1.

As teaching these claimed aspects, the *Office Action* points to column 13, lines 50-53, 58-60, and 63-64 of *Magret* and the home agent 240 as teaching the claimed “home agent.”

*Office Action*, p. 3. However, *Magret's* home agent 240 fails to teach, or even suggest, “a home agent operable to receive IP packets addressed to the mobile unit . . . [and] to encapsulate the IP packets as payloads for multicast packets addressed to the multicast address,” as the claim requires.

In the cited portion, *Magret* teaches that home agent 240 receives packets destined for a mobile node and tunnels those packets to the mobile node’s care of address, which “corresponds to the MAR’s 230 IP address.” *Magret*, col. 13, ll. 50-54. The foreign domain’s mobile access router (MAR) 230 receives those packets and sends them to a multicast group 260 assigned to the mobile node. *Id.* at col. 13, ll. 54-64. Accordingly, even assuming, for the sake of argument, that *Magret's* MAR 230 may send packets to a multicast group, the home agent 240 fails to teach “a home agent operable . . . to encapsulate the IP packets as payloads for multicast packets addressed to the multicast address,” as Claim 1 requires. Moreover, *Magret's* main access router (MAR) 230 in a foreign domain also fails to teach the “home agent” required by the claim.

Thus, *Magret* does not describe, expressly or inherently, each and every limitation required by Claim 1. Independent Claims 6, 14, 22, and 25 include limitations that, for substantially similar reasons, are not taught by *Magret*. Because *Magret* does not disclose, expressly or inherently, every element of independent Claims 1, 6, 14, 22, and 25, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of Claims 1, 6, 14, 22, and 25 and their respective dependent claims.

**II. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103 -- Claims 4, 13, 21, 24, and 32 are patentable over the proposed Magret-Kim combination.**

The Examiner rejects Claims 4, 13, 21, 24, and 32 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over *Magret* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,070,075 issued to Kim (“*Kim*”).

As described above, Applicant has shown that *Magret* fails to disclose all limitations of independent Claims 1, 6, 14, 22, and 25. Accordingly, *Magret* fails to teach or suggest all limitations of Claims 4, 13, 21, 24, and 32 because these dependent claims incorporate the limitations of their respective independent claims. *Kim* fails to remedy the deficiencies of *Magret*.

Thus, *Magret* and *Kim*, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all limitations of Claims 4, 13, 21, 24, and 32. Because the references fail to teach all

limitations of the claims, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of Claims 4, 13, 21, 24, and 32.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicant has made an earnest attempt to place the Application in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons, and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully requests full allowance of all pending claims. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference or an interview would advance prosecution of the Application in any manner, the undersigned attorney for Applicant stands ready to conduct such a conference at the convenience of the Examiner.

No fees are believed to be due; however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.  
Attorneys for Applicant



Kurt M. Pankratz  
Reg. No. 46,977  
(214) 953-6584

Date: August 8, 2007

**Customer ID No. 05073**